

this, all that a person has to do is be a member of a church and not believe anything. Constitutional rights do not run to churches, they run to individuals. It is an individual's belief which has to be respected against state intrusion. This bill, this amendment does not require the individual to believe anything. So it could be somebody who just does not want to undergo the test but could establish that he or she belongs...that she, belongs to an established church and then be out from under it. I do believe that the Legislature has an obligation even while trying to placate those who give us free newspapers to do only those things which are constitutional and proper. Remember, with the way this amendment is drafted, Senator Lamb, you are saying that the condition which must be met before a person can claim exemption from this test is that she belong to an established church. I approve and support wholeheartedly what Senator Fenger is doing and now I will let Senator Beutler stand up here and try to subvert the Constitution.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Senator Chambers, for ascribing to me such lofty motives. This is our sixth debate this year on a couple of exemptions that have been in the law for a number of years. I didn't know there was such strong feelings on the part of a portion of the Legislature to get rid of the exemptions. One of the principal arguments today has been with regard to the language of the amendment, that is the language with regard to the established church. Let me refresh your memory. When we first debated this a couple of months ago this language was in the first amendment and they got up and talked about the established church so we changed it so that so that it was any religious conviction and then of course they got up and argued that that was way too broad and they didn't want that either. So then we defeated it as you will recall and then we came back and put it back on again. The language that is before you now is the language that was in the current statute. You will not make anybody any happier by changing that language. Obviously what they want is to get rid of the exemption altogether. Senator Fenger indicated that he thought the loophole created in the law by the exemption was so big you could drive a truck through it. I suggest to you that the loophole is so small that you could not put your little finger through it. I want to point out to you again and I hate to repeat what has been said before but since everybody who has got up today has repeated what has been said before, then I would simply refresh your memory also on what has been said before. But I wanted to point out to you again that there were 8,000 cases screened. Of that, 789 were susceptible. Now when you consider the